

CULTURAL AFFAIRS TASK FORCE
FINAL REPORT

Submitted to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
October 5, 1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1
II. Issues and Recommendations 4
III. Discussion 9
IV. Conclusion 16
V. List of Task Force Members 17
VI. Appendices 19

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

OCT 16 1992

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CULTURAL AFFAIRS TASK FORCE

FINAL REPORT

Submitted to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
October 5, 1992

I. Introduction

Our common culture, in America, is a product of fusion: a European-African-Asian-Pacific-Latino-Native American blend. San Francisco is a fusion city. Our streets, schoolyards, shops, restaurants and voter rolls reveal a rich mix. But in our artistic life, and particularly our patterns of arts funding, the European influence dominates. On the edge of the Pacific, we still look for artistic excellence across the Atlantic. This report looks forward to a time when San Francisco's high culture reveals as many roots as our haute cuisine.

The Cultural Affairs Task Force believes that the many traditions which meet here can thrive side by side and enrich each other; that the European tradition can continue to flourish while artists, art forms, and arts organization of other backgrounds grow. We are confident that if half the artistic promise now present in our city can be realized, San Francisco will be an international arts capital of the coming age.

San Francisco is one of the richest artistic environments in the world. The city has long been known as an international center for poetry, dance and opera, and in recent decades also for theater, music, ethnic dance, independent film and video, and new genres of performance. Street artists have become our trademark and comedians one of our chief exports. San Francisco performing groups of every size and culture tour worldwide as do many of our solo artists. We boast more than 400 performing, visual, and literary arts organizations, from microtheaters and galleries with budgets in four digits to the Symphony and Opera at \$30 million apiece; dozens of advanced conservatories, fine arts colleges, performance facilities and presenters, technical service organizations, archives, literary journals, and arts education programs. Our city will soon boast new homes for museums of Mexican, Asian, European and Modern art. We are home to some 13,000 artists, and thousands more technicians, stagehands and administrators. More than 300 artists maintain studios at the Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard alone.

Arts audiences number in the millions, comprised of locals and visitors. When visual artists held Open Studio in 1991, more than 30,000 visitors accepted the invitation. The direct income generated by the city's artists and nonprofit arts institutions is conservatively estimated at well over \$240 millions a year, and one out of eleven jobs in San Francisco depends on the arts.

COLUMBIAN EXHIBIT

Final Report

Submitted to the Board of Directors
of the Columbian Exposition

The following report is submitted to the Board of Directors of the Columbian Exposition, in accordance with the resolution of the Board, passed at its meeting on the 10th day of June, 1892, and is intended to show the progress of the work done during the year ending on the 31st day of December, 1892.

The work of the Board of Directors during the year ending on the 31st day of December, 1892, has been directed towards the completion of the plans for the Exposition, and the securing of the necessary funds for its support.

The Board of Directors has during the year ending on the 31st day of December, 1892, held ten regular meetings, and has also held several special meetings. At these meetings the Board has considered and approved the following resolutions:

1. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold regular meetings at least once a month, and should also hold special meetings whenever necessary.
2. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
3. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
4. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
5. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
6. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
7. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
8. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
9. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
10. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.

The Board of Directors has during the year ending on the 31st day of December, 1892, also held several special meetings, at which it has considered and approved the following resolutions:

1. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold regular meetings at least once a month, and should also hold special meetings whenever necessary.
2. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
3. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
4. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
5. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
6. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
7. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
8. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
9. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.
10. That the Board of Directors should continue to hold its meetings at the Hotel Hamilton, in the City of New York.

But our arts ecosystem is endangered. In the 1990's many, perhaps most, of San Francisco's artists and arts organizations are experiencing severe economic stress. The organizational death rate is rising and the birth rate dropping sharply. Part of this stress is due to the current recession, part to ever-rising space costs, and part to other long-term trends (see Appendix I.) Equally grave, for a city with our diverse population, few if any multicultural arts institutions have achieved secure levels of support.

Throughout the city's history, but particularly in the last 30 years, city government, through its grant and commission programs, facilities, zoning ordinances, research and planning, has played a key role in developing the arts. This report asks the Supervisors to take several new steps to keep our arts environment healthy and growing, and to help us move toward cultural equity. The City should spend at least as much energy maintaining threatened arts space and organizations as it does fighting for a sports franchise. The arts need significant new City investment, soon.

The Cultural Affairs Task Force, an unwieldy, quarrelsome body of 59 people representing all the competing, often hostile sectors of San Francisco's arts scene, recognizes that one requirement for our common prosperity is a united, mutually supportive arts community. We have come to agreement on a vision of the future, a set of guiding principles, and a number of recommendations.

We were less successful in carrying out what appeared to be the easier half of our mandate. Our survey of city arts funding remains incomplete, in part because it turned out to require more time and effort than a volunteer committee could give it, in part because information proved surprisingly difficult to obtain. Arts agencies in other cities were more forthcoming than some San Francisco agencies and institutions. We recommend that this work be continued by the Budget Analyst.

Background

The Cultural Affairs Task Force was created by the Board of Supervisors in March, 1991 with the following mandate:

That said Task Force shall make a survey of the current state of arts funding in the City and County of San Francisco, including departmental mandates and legal requirements;

That said Task Force shall do a comparative study of current arts and cultural departments, or policies in other Major Arts Cities in the United States;

That said Task Force shall consider, review and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on the means by which the City and County of San Francisco can enhance the public process and oversight, and improve the mechanisms by which the City supports the economic health and vitality of its diverse cultural life.

The wording of the mandate gives little indication of the heated debate within the arts community which led to the formation of the Task Force. This was the latest outbreak of an long-simmering war over city funding that dates back at least to the middle 1960's, between the large-budget, established arts institutions and newer arrivals on the scene. The conflict was the reason the Task Force swelled to 59 members, as competing interests lobbied for seats; it was the -- usually unspoken -- subtext of Task Force meetings; and it constantly informed the subcommittees' work. Rather than paper over the conflict in this final report we have chosen to acknowledge it, as significant context for the recommendations which follow .

From the point of view of the "haves"--the large-budget performing organizations and museums--stable arts funding in San Francisco is periodically threatened by eruptions of demagoguery, when volatile coalitions goaded by irresponsible, self-appointed leaders make outrageous financial demands on behalf of obscure artists and marginal groups which will probably not last long enough to create anything of value even if money is given to them, and which are only too willing to destroy the hard-won achievements of the established organizations.

From the "have-not" point of view, a handful of stuffy, white-run institutions, contemptuous of all others, hogs nearly all the resources in a multicultural city, defends them with all the political power money can buy against the legitimate demands of a changing population, and uses them to deliver safe, Eurocentric culture to an aging, increasingly suburban audience.

A year of working together has softened these perceptions only slightly. We believe that our disagreements give our agreements special weight. The following guidelines and recommendations are the expression of an arts community united in spite of its differences.

San Francisco, Arts City for the 21st Century -- The Task Force Vision

In the ideal San Francisco of the near future, all the cultures and subcultures that meet and fuse in our city will be expressed in thriving, visible arts organizations of all kinds and all sizes. New large-budget institutions rooted in the Asian, Pacific, Latino, African-American and Gay/Lesbian communities will emerge and flourish alongside the Opera, Symphony, and Ballet. All artists and arts organizations will be aware of their interdependence. The city will recognize, and subsidize, the contributions of individual creative artists as well as arts institutions. The goals of expanding the art market and arts employment will be high on the agendas of our Supervisors, our Mayor, and our Chief Administrative Officer. A new generation of critics with varied cultural backgrounds will educate the public about the city's bountiful and varied artistic offerings. Arts education will be part of the basic curriculum in all grades at our public schools. More arts jobs, and a better-developed market for art, will mean mature artists no longer have to leave San Francisco in search of a living. Artists at all career stages

will receive the minimum wage and basic benefits due all workers in our society. The arts will prosper on every level, from our street corners to our palaces of culture. The vitality of our artistic life will be celebrated worldwide, and will draw visitors by the millions to our city.

Guiding Principles

City arts policy at all levels should be based on the following principles:

- It is the City's goal to achieve cultural equity: a situation in which every art form, from all segments of the population, has the opportunity to develop to its maximum potential.
- All forms of city involvement in the arts should be informed by public process.
- Artistic creativity is a civic good, and its encouragement by government is a fundamental mark of a civilized city.
- Artistic expression is vital to our civic health. The arts and arts education are no more luxuries than are public schools, public libraries, and public transportation: they are among the requirements for a decent life that a civilized community provides to all its citizens.
- A healthy arts environment thrives at all levels. The overall productive vitality of individual artists, grassroots groups and small and midsize arts organizations is as important to the City as the strength of our large arts institutions.
- The arts are a major employer in San Francisco, and a major factor in attracting tourism. Like other industries, they can be forced out by adverse economic conditions. Keeping all the arts in town should be a priority of city government.

II. Issues and Recommendations

Issues

The current debate was sparked by two events, not unrelated. In 1988 the widely-read "Jones Report #2" indicated that when all forms of subsidy were counted, 94.9% of city arts money went to white-run institutions. The numbers have been disputed, but no one denies that the lion's share of funds goes to the largest-budget organizations. In 1990, Grants for the Arts sponsored the multicultural Festival 2000, which spent \$500,000 of city money, then collapsed leaving dozens of commissioned artists, arts organizations, vendors and independent contractors holding the bag. Though most

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the position of the various groups. It is a very general and superficial treatment of the subject, but it is a good starting point for a more detailed study.

The second part of the report deals with the economic situation of the country. It is a very general and superficial treatment of the subject, but it is a good starting point for a more detailed study.

The third part of the report deals with the social situation of the country. It is a very general and superficial treatment of the subject, but it is a good starting point for a more detailed study.

The fourth part of the report deals with the political situation of the country. It is a very general and superficial treatment of the subject, but it is a good starting point for a more detailed study.

The fifth part of the report deals with the cultural situation of the country. It is a very general and superficial treatment of the subject, but it is a good starting point for a more detailed study.

The sixth part of the report deals with the military situation of the country. It is a very general and superficial treatment of the subject, but it is a good starting point for a more detailed study.

The seventh part of the report deals with the foreign relations of the country. It is a very general and superficial treatment of the subject, but it is a good starting point for a more detailed study.

II. General and Summary

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the position of the various groups. It is a very general and superficial treatment of the subject, but it is a good starting point for a more detailed study.

The second part of the report deals with the economic situation of the country. It is a very general and superficial treatment of the subject, but it is a good starting point for a more detailed study.

debts to artists were eventually paid by GFTA, murmuring discontent became an uproar. Critics focused on ethnic imbalance in funding and the lack of public accountability in GFTA decision making. Some called for all city arts funding to be centralized under the Arts Commission.

The Task Force began its work with several hotly contested questions on the table -- or more precisely, under the table:

- Should city arts funds be radically redistributed?
- Should GFTA's streamlined decision making, by staff in closed meetings, be replaced by a public process and a peer panel system?
- Should the several unrelated funding streams for the arts be placed under the authority of the Arts Commission? Should the Commission and its programs then be reconstituted as a new Department of Cultural Affairs?
- Should the free maintenance and subsidized rents received by major arts institutions occupying city-owned buildings, in return for their capital contributions to those buildings, be counted along with their direct grants in calculating their share of the city's arts dollar?

Other questions were less controversial, but were burning issues for different constituencies:

- Should the city make grants to individual artists, to arts groups lacking nonprofit legal status, and to "amateur" groups?
- Should the city create technical assistance programs?
- Should it fund arts education in public schools?
- Should it subsidize the acquisition of live/work and performance space?

Obviously, the bottom-line question after all these is: where should the money come from? In boom times, it would be easy to say "make the pie bigger," but given the current financial crisis, that is a long-range hope. At present we must either deny pressing claims and defer our goal of progress toward cultural equity, or we must cut the pie differently.

Recommendations

On the burning issue of redistributing funds, the Task Force recommends substantial, gradual change rather than any sudden, massive shock to our arts ecology.

On the big question of creating a lead agency for the arts, no agreement was reached.

All of the issues are addressed, and some resolved, in the following recommendations:

1) Additional Funding

In 1995 when the Candlestick Park revenue bonds have been retired, allocate an additional 2% of Hotel Tax funds to GFTA.

2) New Programs

The City should establish and substantially fund a Cultural Equity Endowment focused on four priorities:

1. Cultural Equity Initiatives.
2. Commissions to individual creative artists in all disciplines.
3. Project grants to small and midsize arts organizations.
4. Artspace Initiatives or facilities acquisition program.

The City should initiate these programs in 1993-94 with funds from two sources:

1. Permanently allocate a percentage of Hotel Tax funds to the Cultural Equity Endowment.
2. Reduce by one half the .5% of Hotel Tax Funds now assigned to the Unanticipated Events Fund, and use this 0.25% to support the Cultural Equity Endowment.

These programs should be administered by the Art Commission, by GFTA, or by both agencies working together. Funds should be awarded through a public panel system. A percentage of any funds assigned to the new programs should be reserved for administration.

3) Funding Changes

The Task Force recommends that the Board of Supervisors create a Cultural Equity Endowment as a small but annually recurring slice of the Hotel Tax pie. We propose that the fund be established at 1% in 1993-94, grow to 1.5% in 1994-95, and stabilize at 2% in 1995-96.

To minimize the impact on current Hotel Tax recipients, we recommend that the new slice be created by shaving funds equally from the five existing recipients: Moscone Convention Center/Brooks Hall/Civic Auditorium; Convention and Visitors Bureau; War Memorial; Candlestick Park; and Publicity and Advertising Fund. It is hoped that up to \$300,000 can be obtained from the part of the Hotel Tax fund that is currently unallocated.

To minimize the impact of this funding shift on GFTA ongoing support, any savings resulting from a study of War Memorial operations should be allocated to GFTA's Operating Grants program.

4) Grants for the Arts

GFTA's Operating Grants program should be continued with the following changes:

1. The current progressive formula, under which small institutions receive a greater percentage of their annual budget than large ones, should be changed from a set of categories to a graduated curve. This will eliminate sharp drops as organizations move to the next category, and sharp disparities between organizations of comparable budget size.
2. Over the next three years, exceptions should be eliminated and all grants brought into conformity with the formula or curve.
3. Reduce by one half the .5% of Hotel Tax Funds now assigned to the Unanticipated Events Fund, and transfer this 0.25% to the new programs.
4. First-time applications should be considered, appeals heard and policy, including the funding curve, adopted by a panel including artists and other arts professionals, in open meetings.

5) Leading Agency/Arts Liaison

In the absence of a leading agency, the Task Force urgently recommends the restoration of the Arts Liaison position in the Mayor's office to expedite city action in the arts.

6) Neighborhood Cultural Centers

A general obligation bond issue should be placed on the ballot in 1994 to help support the capital improvement and infrastructure needs of the Neighborhood Cultural Centers. Adequate maintenance of the Neighborhood Cultural Centers should become a line item in the city budget.

7) War Memorial Performing Arts Center

The Board of Supervisors should request an independent study of the War Memorial Performing Arts Center to determine whether economies can be realized in the administration of Davies Symphony Hall, the War Memorial Building and the War Memorial Opera House.

8) Yerba Buena Center for the Arts

The Board of Supervisors should seriously consider the recommendations for better planning and community outreach by the Yerba Buena Center that are contained in the Redevelopment Agency's recently completed study.

9) Arts Education

Funds from Prop J should be allocated to the Arts Commission to expand its Arts Education Program.

10) Funding Study

To complete the work of the Task Force, the Board of Supervisors should ask the Budget Analyst to survey and analyze all city arts funding in order to obtain an accurate picture of how the city spends its arts dollars.

III. Discussion

1) Additional Funding

The Task Force is well aware that our city faces severe financial constraints. Therefore we have not proposed any significant increase in appropriation to arts programs; instead we propose some reallocation of funds to respond to high priority needs. Nevertheless, the Task Force strongly believes the city's long-term interests would be well served by an increase in support to the GFTA's basic arts grants programs and to the Cultural Equity Endowment.

We recommend a future 2% increase in the arts' share of hotel tax funds, to be taken from revenues that will be freed in 1995 by the retirement of the Candlestick Park bonds. This would involve no cut in dollars to the General Fund; the increase would be entirely dependent on increased available funds.

2) Cultural Equity Endowment

The Task Force believes cultural equity will be achieved through equal opportunity and equal access to resources, not by a mechanical application of demographic percentages. However, we believe change is called for in a city where the majority are people of color, but all except one of the largest arts organizations are devoted to European-based arts; a city widely regarded as a lesbian/gay capital, where the country's chief lesbian/gay theater is in danger of closing.

Most of San Francisco's large-budget organizations grew to prominence when they were the only shows in town. (In the late 1950's, there were 25 non-commercial arts organizations in the city; today there are over 400.) When the Hotel Tax fund began making arts grants based on budget size, long-established organizations had an enormous lead. All of our six largest arts institutions except the American Conservatory Theatre have occupied city-subsidized facilities for many decades, while all but a lucky handful of our small arts organizations exist at the mercy of the real estate market. The largest organizations have an additional advantage in appealing, unlike others, to an audience that has time and money to contribute to the arts.

The Task Force recommends the creation of a Cultural Equity Endowment, to provide additional support in the form of discretionary project grants to multicultural, women's and lesbian/gay arts, to small and midsize arts organizations in general, and to individual artists of all cultures and disciplines. The Endowment should be financed by a reallocation of Hotel Tax funds (see Page 12).

Of the 12 cities studied in our National Cities Survey, half provide both project grants and operating support, and two of these reserve project grants for small and midsize organizations. The Task Force recommends grants in four categories:

Cultural Equity Initiatives. This program should have a very broad mandate: invest city funds creatively to promote cultural equity and make San Francisco a multicultural capital of the arts. The Task Force envisions the greatest possible flexibility in this program. A multicultural, multidisciplinary public panel, which includes working artists and arts administrators, should annually adopt priorities for funding, based on needs and opportunities. In one year it might fund projects affecting whole classes of artists or arts organizations: for example, technical assistance programs for emerging organizations, or internships and fellowships for multicultural arts administrators. In another it might fund culturally specific performances and exhibitions. In another it might make a large investment in a single organization.

As multicultural artists and arts organizations grow with this assistance, their share of GFTA operating grants will grow also. A specific long-term goal of the program should be to foster the emergence of new "major" institutions representing historically underserved cultures.

Commissions to individual creative artists. San Francisco teems with visual artists, writers, composers, filmmakers, choreographers and solo author-performers, many with national and international reputations. Most receive no subsidy from the city. Three Art Commission programs: Art in Public Places, the Market Street Art In Transit Program, and the new Arts Education Literary Arts Pilot Program have begun to address this need, but even they lack a stable funding base. Dance Bay Area, New Langton Arts, and the Film Arts Foundation (15-20 grants a year each), have commission programs for their art forms as well, partly funded by GFTA. But of 168 unaffiliated artists who responded to our Needs Assessment survey, 97% reported that the system did not serve them.

The California Arts Council terminated its Individual Artists program in September, 1992, after the state budget cuts. New content restrictions by the National Endowment for the Arts are making hard times especially hard for San Francisco's lesbian and gay artists. The Task Force recognizes that programs for individual artists present special challenges for administration; nevertheless, four of the 12 cities we surveyed offer such programs. We recommend that San Francisco become a model of local support for this vital sector of the arts community.

The Task Force debated the merits of commissions vs. fellowship programs. We concluded that art and artists tend to be taken more seriously when they are seen to be producing tangible works for the public. We recommend expanding the Art Commission's existing programs to make commissions available to creative artists in all disciplines, at all career levels. Performing, literary and media artists, as well as visual

artists, would be contracted to produce specific works to be exhibited, placed, or presented in San Francisco.

Project grants to small and midsize arts organizations. These organizations take artistic risks that larger institutions can't take, and are a proving ground for new artists and new art. Further, most of our multicultural, women's and lesbian/gay arts organizations are in this category. Many enjoy international reputations, but nearly all are struggling financially and several are in danger of closing. Small organizations are subsidized principally by artists' and administrators' unpaid labor. Midsize organizations have the burdens of payrolls and building costs, without endowments or access to major private funding. Both are chronically forced to defer promising projects and needed improvements. GFTA is the most reliable source of support for many of these organizations, but it lacks funds for special investments, makes grants only after an organization has been operating for at least three years, and only funds those with 501(c)(3) tax exempt status.

The new program should make one-time grants of varying size available to arts organizations in all disciplines, for artistic, technical and administrative projects designed to advance or stabilize organizations. A gallery, for example, might receive funds to put on a special exhibition, fix its roof, or hire a manager. Groups should be eligible after one year of achievement instead of three. Federal 501(c)(3) tax exempt status should not be required.

Artspace Initiatives. High space costs are one of the biggest obstacles to the continued vitality of the arts in San Francisco. The City currently administers a loan program for small and midsize arts organizations, mostly aimed at code improvements. The new program would support the development of facilities, for both arts organizations and individual artists. City funds would rarely be adequate to secure the outright purchase of land or buildings, but the program could be instrumental in leveraging loan capital, and in financing planning, capital campaigns and technical assistance. An appendix describes a national public/private program to promote development of cultural facilities; the Task Force recommends the Art Commission consider joining this program.

Program Implementation. The Task Force asks the Board of Supervisors to appoint a special panel of arts professionals representing the maximum possible variety of cultures, disciplines, and economic sectors of the arts community, plus representatives of the Art Commission, Grants for the Arts, and the San Francisco Foundation, to design the new programs and determine how they should be administered. The programs should be administered by the Art Commission, by GFTA, or by both agencies working together. Grants for all but the Artspace initiative, which requires technical and financial expertise, should be awarded by public panels. A percentage of all funds allocated to the programs should be set aside for administration. It is not the

Task Force's intention to create an elaborate administrative apparatus. Regranting, contracting out, and other means of minimizing bureaucracy are encouraged.

3) Funding Changes

In declaring that a healthy arts environment thrives at all levels, the Task Force commits itself to the long-term support of our largest cultural institutions. To damage or destabilize them would diminish San Francisco. At the same time, we are committed to moving toward cultural equity.

The Task Force recommends that the Board of Supervisors create a Cultural Equity Endowment as a new but small annually recurring slice of the hotel tax pie. In order to minimize the new program's negative impact on current hotel tax recipients, it is recommended that the Endowment be assembled incrementally over the next three years, according to the following schedule:

<i>1993-94</i>	<i>1.0% of Hotel Tax Fund¹</i>
<i>1994-95</i>	<i>1.5% of Hotel Tax Fund</i>
<i>1995-96</i>	<i>2.0% of Hotel Tax Fund</i>
<i>and thereafter</i>	

To accomplish this, the percentage assigned to each of the five current hotel tax recipients (Moscone Convention Center, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium; Convention and Visitors Bureau; War Memorial; Candlestick Park; Publicity and Advertising Fund [GFTA]) other than low-cost housing will each be reduced equally as needed to yield the above percentages for the Cultural Equity Endowment. It is hoped that the first 0.53% can come from the unallocated portion of the Hotel Tax. If Hotel Tax revenues continue to increase as in the past, there should be no loss of revenue to any recipient and, in fact, all should continue to receive increased funding². The Cultural Equity Endowment will be used to fund the new programs introduced in #2 above.

¹The Hotel Tax is currently set at 11%. Of that percentage, 3% is obligated to the General Fund and to debt service for the expansion of the Moscone Convention Center. Percentages in this section are based upon the 8% of the tax that remains.

²For example, to attain a 1% Endowment in 1993, if .53% comes from the unallocated portion of the Hotel Tax, .47% will have to come from the five named recipients, or .094% each. Assuming a 5% increase in 1993 Hotel Tax receipts over 1992, the smallest recipient, Candlestick Park, would go from 6.23% of \$55,671,000, or \$3,471,000 to 6.14% of \$58,454,000, or \$3,589,600, an increase of \$118,600, or 3.42%. The largest recipient, Moscone-Brooks-Civic, would go from 42% of \$55,671,000, or \$23,399,000, to 41.9% of \$58,454,000, or \$24,514,000, an increase of \$1,115,000, or 4.77%.

In addition:

Reduce by one half the .5% of Hotel Tax funds now assigned to Unanticipated Events, and transfer .25% to the Cultural Equity Endowment.

4) *Grants for the Arts*

Nationally, GFTA is regarded as a model grants program. San Francisco pioneered hotel tax funding of the arts; our National Cities Survey shows the idea has been widely copied. Locally, however, there is criticism.

The Needs Assessment Committee surveyed small-budget, midsized, and large-budget organizations, asking whether the current system of arts funding should be retained, restructured, or reformed. The results are revealing: large-budget organizations wanted no change; midsize organizations wanted some change; small-budget organizations wanted to restructure the system.

Midsized and large organizations expressed a high degree of satisfaction with GFTA, especially with the simplicity of its criteria and procedures, its low administrative costs compared to a panel system, and above all with the stable funding it provides. Established organizations who presumably would meet any artistic criterion applauded the fact that the GFTA process does not involve artistic debates and were vehement in their insistence that the operating grants program not be changed. Small-budget organizations, on the other hand, reported that the initial process of "getting on the list" often seemed arbitrary; that many had to wait longer than the prescribed 3 years; and that first-time grants were too low.

The Task Force considers that for the operating grants program, the present system of applying public relations criteria ("to advertise and promote the city of San Francisco") rather than artistic ones, and routine decision making by staff, is appropriate and economical. We further note that the GFTA funding formula is commendably progressive; large-budget organizations have seen their funding level in the GFTA operating grants program cut by 25% in the last 3 years, from 4.31% of their budgets to 3.3%, while some smaller organizations receive as much as 25% of their budgets from GFTA. However, the categorical formula produces some sharp drops and disparities, and we recommend that it be replaced by an equally progressive graduated curve. To eliminate complaints that awards can be arbitrary and charges that GFTA sometimes rewards its friends and punishes its enemies, we also recommend that over the next three years, all grants be brought into conformity with the curve. Finally, in view of the 3-year waiting period for GFTA, we recommend that first-time grants, currently 5% of an organization's budget, be funded according to the curve.

Much of the criticism of GFTA focused on the lack of public scrutiny over the Unanticipated Events Fund, out of which GFTA funded Festival 2000. The Task Force notes that a discretionary fund is a valuable resource for the arts community, the tourism industry, and city government; however we feel that many items on this list could appropriately be funded by the new Project Grants program, where they would be subject to public review. Accordingly, we recommend that half the funds now assigned to Unanticipated Events go to the new Project Grant program.

Finally, to ensure public process, we recommend that policy be formulated, the funding curve adopted, and first-time applications and appeals be heard by the advisory panel in open meetings.

5) Lead Agency

At present the arts have no unified voice in City Hall. No city agency is charged with planning and future vision for this vital industry. No one in city government has oversight; indeed no one in San Francisco has even a passing familiarity with all of the programs through which 23 different city agencies spend money on art. (See Appendix). A lead agency would insure accountability, eliminate duplication of programs, provide leadership to the arts community, give the arts a voice in government, and press the City to actively address the challenges and opportunities a changing San Francisco presents to the arts.

No one seriously disputes these points. Defenders of the status quo argue that the cure might be worse than the disease. They see the abundance of city programs as richness, not confusion. They predict rising administrative costs, pointing to the National Endowment for the Arts and the California Arts Council as examples of central agencies' tendency to bureaucratize. Our Direct Funding Committee survey reports little actual overlap. Why, the opponents of centralization ask, disrupt flourishing programs which have grown up organically as needs and opportunities arise, for the sake of an abstract ideal of streamlined government? Finally, they argue that, especially in view of the present city budget crisis, when existing departments are sustaining deep budget cuts, a new department would simply cost too much.

Neither side pressed for a vote on this issue. Instead we recommend that the position of Arts Liaison in the Mayor's Office be restored immediately.

6) Neighborhood Cultural Centers

A glaring example of cultural inequity in San Francisco is the contrast between the states of repair and maintenance of two sets of city-owned buildings: the War Memorial complex and the Neighborhood Cultural Centers. These Centers were created in the

late 1970's when construction began on Davies Symphony Hall, as an expression of the city's commitment to community-based arts. They house a number of arts organizations and arts programs serving youth, the elderly, and the economically disadvantaged by providing arts classes, workshops, performances, exhibitions, and festivals particular to their communities' cultures. These facilities have never received the necessary funding to eliminate building inadequacies. The four centers should be brought up to fire, health and life safety requirements and a phased program of repair and improvements such as adding ventilation systems and reconfiguring space should be carried out. To make these Centers full-service cultural buildings of which the City can be proud, adequate maintenance should become a line item in the city budget. Eventually, these Centers should receive a permanent share of the Hotel Tax pie.

The Task Force believes these Centers are an important part of our cultural fabric. Like the War Memorial buildings and our Museums they should be adequately maintained and should be safe and secure. The Task Force recommends that a general obligation bond issue be placed on the ballot in 1994 to upgrade the infrastructure of these Centers.

7) War Memorial Performing Arts Center

Much discussion and debate by the Task Force has revolved around the uses, needs and level of financial support to the War Memorial complex. We believe that these buildings should continue to be administered by the War Memorial Board of Trustees. The Board of Supervisors should request an independent study of the War Memorial Performing Arts Center to determine whether economies can be realized in the administration of Davies Symphony Hall, the War Memorial Building and the War Memorial Opera House.

We recommend that any savings that result from this study be reallocated to Grants for the Arts and assigned to the Operating Grants program.

8) Yerba Buena Center for the Arts

The Task Force also took note of the substantial impact likely to materialize from the Redevelopment Agency's performing and visual arts buildings at Yerba Buena. Concern was expressed about the plans for operation and funding of these buildings and the possibility of conflict and overlap with many of the City's existing nonprofit and public arts programs. The potential exists for the new facilities to drain off resources within an already fragile arts economy; alternatively, the new facilities could help alleviate the shortage of space for exhibitions and performances. The Agency recently commissioned its own independent analysis, which produced recommendations for better planning and improved communication with the arts

community. The Task Force recommends that the Board of Supervisors seriously consider these recommendations.

9) Arts Education and 10) City Funding Study

We believe these recommendations are self-explanatory.

IV. Conclusion

The Task Force is under no illusion that these recommendations are revolutionary, or that they will produce cultural equity overnight. We see these measures as the logical next steps in an evolution toward cultural pluralism that has been in process for decades, and that will continue. Our goal is to create a richer, more varied cultural environment, not to replace one canon with another. We are equally committed to change, and to insuring that change can go forward without damaging what we already have.

Particularly in this time of financial crisis and attacks on the arts, we place a high value on unity. We ask the Board of Supervisors to implement this report, in the hope that we are inaugurating a new era of cooperation, when all the sectors of our arts community can work together in an atmosphere of mutual support and respect. We believe that by putting these recommendations into effect, the City will be making an investment that over time will stimulate our economy, serve a broader spectrum of the city's residents, generate higher City tax revenues, and build San Francisco's reputation as an international city.

Members of the Final Report Committee

Hon. Maria Acosta-Colon - Mexican Museum; Idris Ackamoor - Cultural Odyssey; Herb Felsenfeld, Committee Chair. - Jon Sims Center for the Performing Arts; Joan Holden - San Francisco Mime Troupe; John Kreidler - San Francisco Foundation; Peter Pastreich - San Francisco Symphony; Pam Peniston - Theatre Rhinoceros; Joyce A. Moffat - San Francisco Ballet; Joanne Chow Winship - San Francisco Art Commission

Members of the Cultural Affairs Task Force

Miriam Abrams - The Women's Philharmonic
Idris Ackamoor - Cultural Odyssey
Hon. Maria Acosta-Colon - Mexican Museum
Jerry Allen - Center for the Arts
Christina M. Augello - EXITheatre
Nancy Bechtle - San Francisco Symphony
Hon. Shirley Black - Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco
Barbara Wood - San Francisco Opera
Vyolet Chu - Chinese Cultural Foundation
Chuck Collins - San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
Chip Conley - Joie De Vivre Hotels
Quentin Easter - Lorraine Hansberry Theatre
Hon. Keith Eickman - The Exploratorium
Herb Felsenfeld - Jon Sims Center for the Performing Arts
Tom Flynn - American Conservatory Theatre
Brian Freeman - Pomo Afro Homos
Merle Goldstone - SF Arts Democratic Club
Gerald P. Gutenstein - Sheraton Fisherman's Wharf
James Haas - James Haas, Esq.
Lisa Streeter Hallinan
Hon. Terence Hallinan, Supervisor - SF Board of Supervisors
Kim Hanadel - Office of the Honorable Milton Marks, State Senator
Charlene Harvey - Grants for the Arts Advisory Committee
Chris Hellman - San Francisco Ballet
Peter Henschel - The Institute for Research on Learning
Joan Holden - Individual Artist, San Francisco Mime Troupe
Woodrow Ichiyasu - Asian Improv Arts
Margaret Jenkins - Margaret Jenkins Dance Company
Jeff Jones - Arts Consultant
Hon. Gregory Kunin - San Francisco Film Commission
John Kreidler - San Francisco Foundation
Rudy Lemcke - San Francisco Art Institute
Paul Lord - San Francisco Planning Department
Hon. Alice Lowe - Asian Art Museum of San Francisco
Stephanie MacColl
Joyce A. Moffatt - San Francisco Ballet
Ellen Newman - San Francisco Symphony
Peter Pastreich - San Francisco Symphony
Pam Peniston - Theatre Rhinoceros
Alice Perez - Office of the Honorable Jim Gonzalez, Supervisor

Harry Polland - Theatrical Federation of San Francisco
Gail Reid - Bayview Opera House
Mark Rennie - Mark Rennie, Esq.
Robert Reveles - San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
Alma Robinson - California Lawyers for the Arts
Thelma Shelley - War Memorial Performing Arts Center
Jose Simon - San Francisco Comedy Celebration Day
Deborah Small - Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
Fran Streets - Wells Fargo Bank
Judy Swift
Roselyne C. Swig - Roselyne C. Swig Artsource
Kola Thomas - Center for African & African-American Arts & Culture
Robert Wilhem - St. Francis Hotel
Joanne Chow Winship - SF Arts Commission
Dennis Wu - San Francisco Ballet
Liza Zenni - Theatre Bay Area

Staff to the Task Force:

Jean-Paul Samaha, Office of the Hon. Terence Hallinan

Final Report:

Principal Writer - Joan Holden
Staff - Larry Larson

Committee Chairs:

IN-KIND: Maria Acosta-Colon and Ellen Newman

FACILITIES: Joyce A. Moffat and Pam Peniston

NATIONAL CITIES SURVEY: Nancy Bechtle and Joan Holden

LOCAL NEEDS: Jerry Allen and Jeff Jones

DIRECT FUNDING: Peter Pastreich and Liza Zenni

Appendix I

Long-Term Trends Affecting The Arts

John Kreidler, San Francisco Foundation

Decreasing leisure time for the average working American, a trend that has been apparent since 1973;

High real estate costs, which affect the availability of artists' live/work spaces as well as facilities for the performing and visual arts;

A decline in disposable income for low and middle income Americans;

A downward trend in corporate support for the arts;

Stagnation in the budget for the National Endowment for the Arts over the past decade, and acute ambiguity surrounding the future existence of the Endowment and the California Arts Council;

Marked changes in age and racial demographics, resulting in diminished demand for some arts services and increase demand for others;

Substantially reduced emphasis on arts education in California's public schools since the late 1970's, which portends reduced audience literacy in the arts;

Lower rates of volunteerism in the arts accompanied by higher labor costs;

The development of regional performing and visual arts centers in Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, San Mateo, Walnut Creek, San Rafael, and Rohnert Park, all of which may result in reduced audiences and funding resources available to the arts environment of San Francisco.

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of

the independent variable on the dependent variable.

The study was conducted in a laboratory setting with a sample of

participants who were randomly assigned to two groups: control and

experimental. The control group received no treatment, while the

experimental group received the treatment.

The results of the study showed that the treatment had a significant

effect on the dependent variable, with the experimental group

showing a higher mean score than the control group.

The findings of this study suggest that the treatment is effective in

improving the outcome of the study.

These results have important implications for the field of research,

as they provide evidence for the effectiveness of the treatment.

Future research should focus on replicating the study with a larger

sample and in a more naturalistic setting to further validate the

findings. Additionally, it would be beneficial to explore the

long-term effects of the treatment and its potential for generalization

to other populations and settings.

CULTURAL AFFAIRS TASK FORCE
FINAL REPORT

Appendix II -- Committee Reports

Direct Funding.....	1.
Facilities.....	3.
In-Kind Support (incomplete).....	11.
National Cities	12.
Needs Assessment.....	17.

*(Copies of the Committee Reports, which are too voluminous for wide distribution,
are available for study at Supervisor Hallinan's office.)*



0124909720

CULTURAL ALPHABET

LOCAL STUDIES

Appendix II - Case Studies

The following case studies are presented in this appendix to illustrate the range of cultural practices and beliefs that are found in the local communities. The studies are arranged in alphabetical order of the community names. Each study is a brief description of the community, its location, and the cultural practices and beliefs that are found there. The studies are intended to provide a general overview of the cultural diversity of the local communities and to highlight the importance of cultural practices and beliefs in the lives of the people of the local communities.

The first case study is of the community of [Community Name], which is located in [Location]. The community is a small village with a population of approximately [Population]. The cultural practices and beliefs of the community are based on [Cultural Practices and Beliefs].

The second case study is of the community of [Community Name], which is located in [Location]. The community is a small village with a population of approximately [Population]. The cultural practices and beliefs of the community are based on [Cultural Practices and Beliefs].

The third case study is of the community of [Community Name], which is located in [Location]. The community is a small village with a population of approximately [Population]. The cultural practices and beliefs of the community are based on [Cultural Practices and Beliefs].